DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 972 TM 006 485

AUTHOR Johnson, David L.
TITLE Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness (IIPGC).
INSTITUTION Institute of Human Resources, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
NOTE 10p.; For related documents, see TM 006 483 and 484

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Check Lists; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Studies; *Group Dynamics; Group Relations; *Group Unity; *Perception; Post Secondary Education; Questionnaires; Social Behavior; Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS *Inventory Individually Perceived Grp Cohesiveness

ABSTRACT

The Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness (IIPGC) is a self-report measure of an individual's perception of group cohesiveness, which is defined as the perceived degree, extent, or strength of mutual attention given by the membership to processes of cooperation, control, and task communication. The IIPGC provides a reliable measure of group cohesiveness on the process dimensions of task communication, cooperation, and expectational control. This inventory is untimed; however, it usually takes no longer than 12 to 15 minutes to administer. The inventory is hand-recorded and scored. This research edition of the IIPGC has been used to study groups of 2-30 people, with members of varying composition (age, sex, racial-ethnic identity, education, etc.) in a variety of settings (playgrounds, conference rooms, pizza parlors, hospitals, libraries, etc.). Field studies on reliability and a copy of the Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness are appended. (Author/MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Johnson, Institute of Human Resources

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED144972

Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness (IIPGC)

by

David L. Johnson, Ph.D.

Author

David L. Johnson, Ph.D. University of Missouri-Columbia, Social Psychologist, Research Sociologist, Consultant, and Director of the Institute of Human Resources, Box 14412, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87111.

Description

The Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness is a self-report measure of an individual's perception of 20 items of content referencing a group's cohesiveness.

Cohesiveness is defined as that group property that can be perceived by individual members regarding the degree, extent, or strength of mutual attention given by the membership to processes of cooperation, control, and task communication.

Although many small group researchers have subscribed to a view that the cohesiveness of a group is generated by a variety of independent forces (c.f., Festinger, Schachter, and Back, 1950), a number of reported studies tend to use almost exclusively sociometric measures of interpersonal "attraction." It is the author's impression that the term, attraction, tends to be too easily elaborated and obscured in meaning with many other forms of emotional attachment, personal satisfaction, and unification with others; i.e., it becomes synonymous with the term, solidarity. The IIPGC attempts to limit the concept of cohesiveness somewhat to those ongoing, but variable social processes which can be observed more readily and reflected upon more easily than the problematic and often fleeting impressions, imagery, intentions, and emotional reactions of self and others.

The IIPGC consists of 20 content items referencing respectively the three dimensions of communication or influence regarding the task (items # 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20), cooperation (items # 2, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17), and expectational control (items # 4, 6, 8, 13, 15). The measure asks each respondent to estimate the degree of attention given in the focal group of interest to each of the items according to the following numerical scale (0 = no emphasis, 1 = slight emphasis, 2 = moderate emphasis, 3 = strong emphasis, 4 = a great deal of emphasis). The summed values yield a total (IIPGC) score (range 0-80) and the respective IIPGC factor scores--task communication (TCOM, range 0-32), cooperation (COP, range 0-28), and expectational control (EXCON, range 0-20). Individual scores may be summed to yield nominal group cohesiveness (GC) scores. The eventual theoretical and empirical importance of

IM006 485

these inter-related aspects of group cohesiveness await further inquiry, use, and refinement.

Norms

This research edition of the IIPGC is in the process of standardization. It has been used to study a wide range and variety of natural social groupings. For example, preschool, day-school, and after-school classrooms; directed and self-paced study groups; counseling, training, and special purpose or interest groups; professional, civic, social, religious, political, recreational, fraternal, sorority groups; clubs, and committees,etc. have been sampled. Also, a rich variety of group sizes(2-30), composition (age, sex, racial-ethnic identity, education, social class, etc.), and settings(playgrounds, conference rooms, pizza parlors, hospitals, waiting rooms, kitchens, libraries, etc.) have been included. Specific details and normative summaries from more than 20 different field studies including intra-group member correlations, intra-group observer correlations, and comparisons between member and observer IIPGC ratings may be found in Technical Report, Number Two,1976.

Time of administration(pre or post-session)

Untimed, but typically no longer than 12 to 15 minutes.

Scoring

Hand-recorded and scored.

Form

One research edition which may be completed by group members(fourth grade and up), observers, evaluators, researchers, etc.

Rationale

The IIPGC is designed to provide a quick and reliable measure of group cohesiveness on the process dimensions of task communication, cooperation, and expectational control. The IIPGC has been used to explore a wide variety of questions. For example, are more homogeneously composed groups with designated leaders more likely to develop cohesiveness than heterogeneous, leader-less groups? Do group members express a higher proportion of creative interpersonal acts in more cohesive groups? Do gifted and talented children perform better in more cohesive groups or by themselves?

Johnson and Ridener(1974) suggested that the tendency to self-disclose information might correspond with respective increases in individually perceived group cohesiveness and self-initiated group participation. Second, that the reported tendency of females to disclose more about themselves than males(c.f.,Jourard,1964)would lead to more positive correlations

with individually perceived group cohesiveness over time. Finally, that self-initiated group participation would be associated positively with individually perceived group cohesiveness.

To answer these questions the 10-item personality and 10-item studies scales from the Self-disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard, 1971) were given to 23 undergraduates. Ss were instructed to relate that they had disclosed nothing (0), only some general things (1), the full details (2), or they had misrepresented themselves (X) on each item. The domination, work, and affiliation categories of participation in the Interpersonal Action Analysis system (Dunphy, 1972) were used. Each distinct, uninterrupted flow of observed communication initiated by one S to another was the unit coded for participation.

On the basis of the SQ personality scale scores Ss were divided into 8 male and 8 female heterogeneous groups, and one homogeneous group of 7 females. Each group attended four 30-minute sessions to discuss issues in higher education. The heterogeneous groups' discussions were recorded on audio-video tape and coded for participation. Mean intercoder reliabilities across the domination, work, and affiliation categories exceeded .75.

A second measure of self-disclosure was obtained by giving the studies scale to all Ss after the third session. Scale scores were correlated .80 ($p < .001$) with the pretest personality scale scores. This correlation suggested some consistency in the tendency to self-disclose over time. The IIPGC was given to all Ss after the second and fourth sessions.

The results indicated that self-disclosure was not associated with any category of participation, but after four sessions was associated significantly ($p < .01$) with males' ($r = .85$) and females' ($r = .64$) individually perceived group cohesiveness scores as expected. Self-disclosure scores were correlated positively to each factor in the IIPGC, but only males' disclosure scores were correlated .79 ($p < .01$) with perceived cooperation. Only females' disclosure scores were correlated .80 with perceived expectational control and .64 with task communication ($p < .01$). Surprisingly there was no correlation between self-disclosure and perceived liking among group members of either sex. These findings did not support Jourard's claim (1971) that self-disclosure was an index of interpersonal "closeness" and that females' rather than males' disclosing was associated more with the development of friendly interpersonal relations.

Total self-initiated participation after four sessions was correlated significantly ($r = .78$, $p < .05$) with individually perceived cohesiveness only for males. Self-initiated participation was correlated significantly with perceived cooperation ($r = .77$), ideas ($r = .74$), norms ($r = .71$), liking ($r = .74$), and influence ($r = .75$) only for males. Participation correlated significantly, but negatively with perceived ideas ($r = -.73$) only in the heterogeneous group of females. These findings provided partial

support for the hypothesis relating males' participation to individually perceived group cohesiveness, but not females'.

Reliability

The following field studies have used the IIPGC to check the stability of individually perceived cohesiveness scores across two points in time. The groups were being observed systematically by trained coders using the SOCIAL INTERACTION AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNICATION SYSTEM(SICCS), 1975.

Study 1.

Sample. A small, voluntary social service group of 4 members (1 black male, 1 black female, 2 white females) with a mean age of 58.3 years. The group is 7 months old and has been conducting Friday luncheon meetings every week. The group meets to raise money and plan activities for Senior citizens.

Setting. A city-based, neighborhood community center meeting room

Number of meetings observed. 4 (planning sessions)

Mean time of observation. 32.8 minutes

Purpose. To document the stability of IIPGC total, influence on task, cooperation, expectational control scores in an ongoing, voluntary social service group observed over 4 meetings. The results are shown in Table 1. No statistically significant shifts between pre-session 1 and post-session 4 variable means were noted.

IIPGC TABLE 1.

	Total		Influence on Task		Cooperation		Expectational Control	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Pre-session 1	19.2	5.7	23.8	1.9	18.8	2.5	13.0	2.6
Post-session 4	16.9	5.6	23.0	1.9	17.3	1.0	10.5	2.7

Study 2.

Sample. A small, voluntary, political group of 3 precinct workers organized to help reelect a state congressman and meeting almost daily.

Setting. Office headquarters of the state congressman

Number of Meetings Observed. 4 (organizational)

Mean Time of Observation. 40 minutes

Purpose. To document the stability of IIPGC total, influence on task, cooperation, and expectational control scores over 4 meetings in a social group organized for one short-term, but specific purpose. The results are shown in Table 2. No statistically significant shifts between pre-session 1 and post-session 4 variable means were noted.

IIPGC TABLE 2.

	Total		Influence on Task		Cooperation		Expectational Control	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Pre-session 1	16.4	6.1	24.7	1.0	13.0	.9	11.7	1.5
Post-session 4	14.3	5.7	21.7	1.5	11.7	1.5	9.7	1.5

Study 3.

Sample. A small, white, middle-class, voluntary, Baptist church group of 7 members. The group has been meeting regularly Wednesday nights for 5 months to discuss social issues facing young people. A designated leader from outside the group presents the topic for the meeting.

Setting. A meeting room in this city-based church

Number of Meetings Observed. 4 (Different topics, e.g., exorcism)

Mean Time of Observation. 60 minutes

Purpose. To document the stability of IIPGC total, influence on task, cooperation, expectational control scores in an ongoing social group observed over 4 meetings. The results are displayed in Table 3. No statistically significant shifts between pre-session 1 and post-session 4 variable means ($t's < 1$) were noted.

IIPGC TABLE 3.

	Total		Influence on Task		Cooperation		Expectational Control	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Pre-session 1	19.1	4.1	23.1	4.3	22.9	3.3	11.3	4.5
Post-session 4	18.1	5.4	21.4	3.5	21.6	1.3	11.1	2.7

Study 4.

Sample. A small group of 4 Campfire Girls (3 black, 1 white) with a mean age of 16.3 years. Each group member comes from a broken home of low socio-economic status, and two members have stuttering problems. The group is encouraged by the local school district to involve themselves more in outdoor and arts/crafts activities. The group meets once every week.

Setting. A room provided by a local, city-based, public elementary school.

Number of Meetings Observed. 4

Mean Time of Observation. 45 minutes

Purpose. To document the stability of IIPGC total, influence on task, cooperation, expectational control scores over 4 meetings of an ongoing social-recreational youth group. The results are reported in Table 4. No statistically significant shifts between pre-session 1 and post-session 4 variable means were noted.

IIPGC TABLE 4.

	Total		Influence on Task		Cooperation		Expectational Control	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Pre-session 1	8.2	3.9	4.8	3.6	12.0	1.3	7.8	2.2
Post-session 4	8.3	3.9	5.0	2.9	12.0	2.5	8.0	2.2

Study 5.

Sample. A small professional nurses and nurses' aids hospital group of 5 females (1 Mexican-American, 1 black, 3 white) with a mean age of 37.8 years. The group meets every other week on Tuesday's and Thursday's between the morning and afternoon shifts.

Setting. A nurses' station in a city-based general hospital

Number of Meetings Observed. 4 (orientation & organizational for group members coming on duty)

Mean Time of Observation. 25.5 minutes

Purpose. To document the stability of IIPGC total, influence on task, cooperation, expectational control scores over 4 meetings in an ongoing professional work group organized to maintain and perform essential hospital duties. The results are displayed in Table 5. No statistically significant shifts between pre-session 1 and post-session 4 variable means were noted.

IIPGC TABLE 5.

	Total		Influence on Task		Cooperation		Expectational Control	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
Pre-session 1	16.3	4.9	22.0	1.4	13.2	4.0	13.8	1.7
Post-session 4	16.6	4.4	22.4	2.1	12.6	4.6	14.0	1.9

Although the range of mean IIPGC scores among these different groups varied considerably (8.2 to 19.2), TCOM (4.8 to 25.8), COP (11.7 to 22.9), EXCON (7.8 to 13.0), the members' within-group mean perceptions of cohesiveness across four observed group sessions between two points of measurement remained consistently stable. Also, Johnson and Ridener (1974) gave the IIPGC to 23 undergraduate college students in experimentally created groups in a small group laboratory setting after each group's second and fourth discussion sessions. A KR 20 split-half reliability estimate of responses to the IIPGC yielded a stable alpha coefficient of .90.

Users

Prospective users of the IIPGC are invited to share any results and/or data summaries of their uses of the IIPGC with the Institute of Human Resources. The IHR would like to continue to share with all users additional normative data as it is collated and reported. Your research and/or program reports and uses of the IIPGC will be appreciated and acknowledged appropriately. Also, IHR will be pleased to assist you in any way possible in the further development, implementation, and application of the IIPGC and other IHR measures. Let us hear from you.

REFERENCES

Dunphy, D. The Primary Group: A Handbook for Analysis and Field Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing. New York: Harper, 1950.

Johnson, D.L. & Ridener, L. Self-disclosure, participation, and perceived cohesiveness in small group interaction, Psychological Reports, 35, 1974, 65-66.

Johnson, D.L. SOCIAL INTERACTION AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNICATION SYSTEM(SICCS), Institute of Human Resources, 1975.

Johnson, D.L. Technical Report, Number Two, Summary of Field Studies and Uses of the Inventory of Individually Perceived Group Cohesiveness (IIPGC), Institute of Human Resources, 1976.

Jourard, S. The Transparent Self. New York: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Jourard, S. Self-disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Individual_____ Group_____ Time_____

Date_____19____ Session #_____ Pre____Post_____

IIPGC

Rate each item for the amount of emphasis you think your group gave it. Answer each item by placing a checkmark in one of the spaces opposite that item.

	Items - Group Discussion	A great deal of emphasis	Strong emphasis	Moderate emphasis	Slight emphasis	No emphasis
1)	Emphasis in the group on discussion					
2)	Emphasis in the group on getting along with each other					
3)	Emphasis in the group on different ideas					
4)	Emphasis in the group on setting priorities					
5)	Emphasis in the group on everyone having their say					
6)	Emphasis in the group on how everyone is supposed to behave					
7)	Emphasis in the group on having a good time					
8)	Emphasis in the group on what is most important					
9)	Emphasis in the group on sticking together					
10)	Emphasis in the group on companionship					
11)	Emphasis in the group on getting things done					
12)	Emphasis in the group on consideration of recommendations					
13)	Emphasis in the group on judgments of value					
14)	Emphasis in the group on involvement					
15)	Emphasis in the group on what ought to be done					
16)	Emphasis in the group on further meetings					
17)	Emphasis in the group on sharing					
18)	Emphasis in the group on commonality of ideas					
19)	Emphasis in the group on decision-making					
20)	Emphasis in the group on specific issues					

TOTAL TCOM____ COP____ EXCON____ IIPGC____

© 1975 by David L. Johnson
All Rights Reserved